UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,539	01/19/2001	Robert E. Dvorak	BLFR 1005-1	9951

22470 7590 09/16/2004

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER	
VAN DOREN, BETH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/766,539	DVORAK, ROBERT E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-115* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-115* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 January 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final, first office action on the merits. Claims 1-115 are pending.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because it appears from the current numbering of the figures that either figures are missing from the disclosure or the figures are misnumbered. The figures are numbered 1, 10, 11, 12, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. Therefore, it is unknown if figures 2-8, for example, are missing or if figure 10 should more appropriately be labeled claim 2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-18, 23-41, 46-64, 69-87, 92-110, and 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Technology Strategy, Inc. (www.grossprofit.com). The following references describe the different features of the service performed by Technology Strategy, Inc.:

i. Screenshots of www.grossprofit.com, which is Technology Strategy, Inc.'s homepage (referred to herein as references A);

ii. Article "Merchants Try Complex Math Tools to Improve Inventory Decisions" by Koloszyc from Stores Magazine (referred to herein as reference B);

iii. Article "Looking Back to Fashion's Future" by Ackerman from The Boston Globe (referred to herein as reference C).

4. As per claim 1, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved management decision support system, including a computer system having memory and resources, a retail demand forecasting program applying one or more forecasting approaches, running on the computer system and generating output, and a set of analysis programs, running on the computer system and utilizing the output, said analysis programs generating at least one of (a) order of goods from a supplier-related data, (b) allocation of the goods to be shipped by the supplier-related data, or (c) distribution of goods to selling locations-related data (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 3, section 4, which discloses a computer system that supports decisions by applying forecasting techniques, running these techniques on the computer to generate output that is used to at least generate order of goods from a supplier-related data or distribution of goods to selling locations-related data), the improvement comprising:

a presentation demand calendar utilized by the forecasting program to generate the output, said presentation demand calendar associating with a plurality of good-selling location pairs, data including a good identifier, a selling location identifier, and one or more presentation quantities each associated with a start date and a stop date (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein a demand schedule associated with specific dates is used to

forecast, the schedule associating good-sellers with data including an identified good, a location of the good, and quantities of the good to be sold between a start and stop date (such as a season)); and

one or more additional analysis programs in the set of analysis programs generating at least two of: open to buy analysis, markdown management analysis, promotional planning or forward buying, bottom-up planning analysis, or top-down planning analysis (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, which discloses at least markdown management and open to buy analysis (i.e. the program plans a markdown schedule to maximize sales and also considers current inventory and current causal factors as the items are available to be bought)).

5. As per claim 2, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the start date and the stop date are implicitly associated with a memory location in which the presentation quantity is stored (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, which discloses the start and stop date being implicitly represented by the selling template, the life cycle demand curve, and other seasonal information).

6. As per claim 3, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches the improved system wherein the start date and the stop date are explicitly stored (See at least reference A, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section

2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein the forecast is stored in the system against dates).

7. As per claim 4, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches the improved system wherein the start dates and stop dates for the one or more presentation quantities define non-overlapping periods (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein the start date and stop date for one quantity is a non-overlapping period).

8 As per claim 5, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the start dates and stop dates for the one or more presentation quantities define overlapping periods (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein the start dates and stop dates for multiple quantities would be overlapping periods including the same season).

9. As per claims 6-9, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the good identifier associated with good-selling location pairs includes a good number and a good description and the selling location identifier associated with good-selling location pairs includes a selling location number and a selling location description, and further includes a good description table and a selling location description table (See at least reference A, page 1, sections 1-3, page 4, sections 1-4, page 5, sections 1-2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, and reference C, page 2, section 4, page 3, sections 4-5, wherein a good number and a good description are stored by location (such as numbers per day for size/color), a selling location

description and sales for the location are stored, and all this information is stored in a data warehouse linked to the model).

10. As per claims 10-12, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system, wherein the set of analysis programs is adapted to basic retail goods, to seasonal retail goods, and to fashion retail goods (See at least reference A, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 5-6, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, sections 3-4, which discloses retail goods, seasonal retail goods, and fashion goods).

11. As per claim 13, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the set of analysis programs operate on daily or more frequent period forecasts (See at least reference B, page 2, sections 6-7, reference C, page 2, section 4, wherein the life cycle demand forecast includes daily forecasts).

12. As per claim 14, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the set of analysis programs operate on weekly forecasts (See at least reference A, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, and reference B, page 2, section 7, which discusses weekly forecasts).

13. As per claim 15, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the set of analysis programs operate on pairings of individual goods in individual selling locations (See at least reference A, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 5-6, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, sections 3-4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein the analysis program operates on pairings of individual goods, such as blue shirt and green shirt in an array of sizes).

14. As per claim 16, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system, wherein the set of analysis programs operate on groups of goods in individual selling locations (See at least

reference A, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 5-6, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, sections 3-4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein an individual stores sales is analyzed).

15. As per claim 17, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the set of analysis programs operate on individual goods in groups of selling locations (See at least reference A, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 5-6, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, sections 3-4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein an individual good is analyzed based on regional information and selling channel, or an individual item is looked at based on size/color information).

16. As per claim 18, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the set of analysis programs operate on groups of goods in groups of selling locations (See at least reference A, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 5-6, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, sections 3-4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein groups of goods in groups of selling locations are analyzed (such as items in inventory per store, items per selling channel, etc.)).

17. As per claim 23, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved system wherein the analysis is utilized by as input to an additional process (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, section 2, and page 4, sections 2-4, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 5-6, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein the results of one analysis is used as input to an additional process, such as end markdowns).

18. As per claim 24, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved management decision support system, including a computer system having memory and resources, a retail demand

forecasting program applying one or more forecasting approaches, running on the computer system and generating output, and a set of analysis programs, running on the computer system and utilizing the output, said analysis programs generating at least one of (a) order of goods from a supplier-related data (b) allocation of the goods to be shipped by the supplier-related data, or (c) distribution of goods to selling locations-related data (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 3, section 4, which discloses a computer system that supports decisions by applying forecasting techniques, running these techniques on the computer to generate output that is used to at least generate order of goods from a supplier-related data or distribution of goods to selling locations-related data), the improvement comprising:

a presentation demand calendar utilized by the forecasting program to generate the output, said presentation demand calendar associating with a plurality of good-selling location pairs, data including a good identifier, a selling location identifier, and one or more presentation quantities associated with a start date and a stop date (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein a demand schedule associated with specific dates is used to forecast, the schedule associating good-sellers with data including an identified good, a location of the good, and quantities of the good to be sold between a start and stop date (such as a season)); and

an additional analysis program in the set of analysis programs generating data reported in open to buy reports (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4,

sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 1-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, which discloses open to buy (i.e. the analysis program considers current inventory and causal factors while the items are available to be bought). This information is available on a subscription basis).

19. As per claims 25-41 and 46, claims 25-41 and 46 recite equivalent limitations to claims 2-18 and 23, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 2-18 and 23, respectively.

20. As per claim 47, Technology Strategy, Inc. teaches an improved management decision support system, including a computer system having memory and resources, a retail demand forecasting program applying one or more forecasting approaches, running on the computer system and generating output, and a set of analysis programs, running on the computer system and utilizing the output, said analysis programs generating at least one of (a) order of goods from a supplier-related data (b) allocation of the goods to be shipped by the supplier-related data, or (c) distribution of goods to selling locations-related data (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 3, section 4, which discloses a computer system that supports decisions by applying forecasting techniques, running these techniques on the computer to generate output that is used to at least generate order of goods from a supplier-related data or distribution of goods to selling locations-related data), the improvement comprising:

a presentation demand calendar utilized by the forecasting program to generate the output, said presentation demand calendar associating with a plurality of good-selling location

pairs, data including a good identifier, a selling location identifier, and one or more presentation quantities associated with a start date and a stop date (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein a demand schedule associated with specific dates is used to forecast, the schedule associating good-sellers with data including an identified good, a location of the good, and quantities of the good to be sold between a start and stop date (such as a season)); and

an additional analysis program in the set of analysis programs generating data reported in markdown management reports (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, which discloses markdown management (i.e. the analysis program determines a markdown schedule)).

21. As per claims 48-64 and 69, claims 48-64 and 69 recite equivalent limitations to claims 2-18 and 23, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 2-18 and 23, respectively.

22. As per claim 70, Technology Strategy, Inc. discloses an improved management decision support system, including a computer system having memory and resources, a retail demand forecasting program applying one or more forecasting approaches, running on the computer system and generating output, and a set of analysis programs, running on the computer system and utilizing the output, said analysis programs generating at least one of (a) order of goods from a supplier-related data, (b) allocation of the goods to be shipped by the supplier-related data or (c) distribution of goods to selling locations-related data (See at least reference A, page 1, section

3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 3, section 4, which discloses a computer system that supports decisions by applying forecasting techniques, running these techniques on the computer to generate output that is used to at least generate order of goods from a supplier-related data or distribution of goods to selling locations-related data), the improvement comprising:

a presentation demand calendar utilized by the forecasting program to generate the output, said presentation demand calendar associating with a plurality of good-selling location pairs, data including a good identifier, a selling location identifier, and one or more presentation quantities associated with a start date and a stop date (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, wherein a demand schedule associated with specific dates is used to forecast, the schedule associating good-sellers with data including an identified good, a location of the good, and quantities of the good to be sold between a start and stop date (such as a season)); and

an additional analysis program in the set of analysis programs generating data reported in bottom-up planning reports (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, which discloses bottom-up planning (the system plans inventory from the current to the future)).

23. As per claims 70-87 and 92, claims 70-87 and 92 recite equivalent limitations to claims 2-18 and 23, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 2-18 and 23, respectively.

24. As per claim 93, Technology Strategy, Inc. disclose an improved management decision support system, including a computer system having memory and resources, a retail demand forecasting program applying one or more forecasting approaches, running on the computer system and generating output, and a set of analysis programs, running on the computer system and utilizing the output, said analysis programs generating at least one of (a) order of goods from a supplier-related data, (b) allocation of the goods to be shipped by the supplier-related data, or (c) distribution of goods to selling locations-related data (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1 and 3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 3, section 4, which discloses a computer system that supports decisions by applying forecasting techniques, running these techniques on the computer to generate output that is used to at least generate order of goods from a supplier-related data or distribution of goods to selling locations-related data), the improvement comprising:

a presentation demand calendar utilized by the forecasting program to generate the output, said presentation demand calendar associating with a plurality of good-selling location pairs, data including a good identifier, a selling location identifier, and one or more presentation quantities associated with a start date and a stop date (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3,

sections 4-5, wherein a demand schedule associated with specific dates is used to forecast, the schedule associating good-sellers with data including an identified good, a location of the good, and quantities of the good to be sold between a start and stop date (such as a season)); and

an additional analysis programs in the set of analysis programs generating data reported in top-down planning reports (See at least reference A, page 1, section 3, page 2, sections 2-3, page 4, sections 2-4, and page 8, section 2, reference B, page 1, sections 1-3, page 2, sections 3-5, and page 3, section 2-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, sections 4-5, which discloses top-down planning that considers the highest level of planning beyond the actual inventory information, such as regional differences and seasonal information that is independent of a specific item).

25. As per claims 94-110 and 115, claims 94-110 and 115 recite equivalent limitations to claims 2-18 and 23, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 2-18 and 23, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-22, 42-45, 65-68, 88-91, and 111-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Technology Strategy, Inc. (see above).

27. As per claims 19-22, Technology Strategy, Inc. discloses a computer system with a database and data warehouse. Analyses are run on Technology Strategy, Inc.'s own site and/or

the client's site and/or in an independent customized software tool that can be run on an ongoing basis. Technology Strategy, Inc. further discusses running the analyses, using the results to plan for the products, stores, etc., saving these results and plan, and updating the results/plan as the season progresses (See at least reference A, page 4, sections 1-4, page 5, section 1-2, and page 8, sections 1-2, reference B, page 2, sections 1 and 6-7, and page 3, sections 1-5, and reference C, page 2, section 4, and page 3, section 5, wherein Technology Strategy, Inc. discusses these computer-related features).

However, Technology Strategy, Inc. does not expressly disclose displaying the analysis on a monitor in communication with the computer system (claim 19), saving the analysis in a spreadsheet file format (claim 20), printing the analysis on paper, microfiche, or optical media (claim 21), or distributing the analysis by e-mail or other messaging facility (claim 22).

Technology Strategy, Inc. discloses a computer system that runs models using data stored in the databases and data warehouses of the system to create a forecast. The forecast is saved in the system and updateable throughout the season. Technology Strategy, Inc. further discloses the use of the Internet and "product-izing" the model info an customized software tool that can be run on an ongoing basis. Viewing information stored in a computer on a monitor or printing out this information using a printer was well known in the computer industry at the time of the invention. Saving information of a database in a spreadsheet file format was well known in the computer industry at the time of the invention. Furthermore, distributing information of an Internet based tool via email was well known in the computer industry at the time of the invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these known computer-related features in the computer system of

Technology Strategy, Inc. in order to more efficiently utilize the information stored in the system by taking advantage of the benefits computers and automation have to offer. It was well known in the art at the time of the invention that computers and automation made it easier to save, distribute, and update information in a reliable and efficient manner.

28. As per claims 42-45, claims 42-45 recite equivalent limitations to claims 19-22, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 19-22, respectively.

29. As per claims 65-68, claims 65-68 recite equivalent limitations to claims 19-22, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 19-22, respectively.

30. As per claims 88-91, claims 88-91 recite equivalent limitations to claims 19-22, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 19-22, respectively.

31. As per claims 111-114, claims 111-114 recite equivalent limitations to claims 19-22, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale relied upon in the rejection of claims 19-22, respectively.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ross et al. (U.S. 6,370,509) teaches a demand planning presentation.

Dulaney et al. (U.S. 6,341,269) discloses an inventory management system that optimizes inventory by using cost information, store level information, etc.

Huang et al. (U.S. 5,953,707) teaches a database management system that utilizes said data for capacity planning.

Huang et al. (U.S. 6,151,582) discloses a decision support system that analyzes stored data to support supply decisions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd
September 9, 2004

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600